



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,591	11/28/2000	Edward J. Dalgewicz III	04756.00006	5236

7590 05/08/2002

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.  
1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

MADSEN, ROBERT A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1761

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2002

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-6

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/722,591	DALGEWICZ, EDWARD J.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Robert Madsen	1761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-77 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

• Art Unit: 1761

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Restriction to an Invention*

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-12,39-47, drawn to a multi-layered food container comprising a polyester layer and a layer comprising a co-polymer or ter-polymer of ethylene and glycidyl acrylate, classified in class 426, subclass 127.
- II. Claim 13-21,48-56, drawn to a multi-layered food container comprising a first polyester layer and a second layer comprising a co-polymer or ter-polymer of ethylene and maleic anhydride, classified in class 426, subclass 127.
- III. Claims 22-38, drawn to a multi-layered container comprising a first polyester layer and a second layer comprising a co-polymer or ter-polymer of ethylene, wherein the multi-layer structure has a particular thickness per layer and stretch ratio, classified in class 428, subclass 212.
- IV. Claims 57-67 drawn to a multi-layered container wherein the first polyester layer comprises a co-polymer or ter-polymer of ethylene and glycidyl acrylate, classified in class 428, subclass 480.
- V. Claims 68-77, drawn to drawn to a multi-layered container wherein the first layer comprises a co-polymer or ter-polymer of ethylene and maleic anhydride, classified in class 428, subclass 480.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Art Unit: 1761

Inventions I and II are distinct because they are multi-layer food containers made from different materials.

Inventions I / II and Invention III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed in either invention I or II does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because there is no layer thickness or stretch ratio limitation for the containers of inventions I and II, as required by invention III. The subcombination has separate utility such as a container for medical equipment.

Inventions I and II are unrelated to Inventions IV and V. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Invention I and II are multi-layer food containers and Inventions IV and V are containers made of a different composition and not containing food.

Invention III is unrelated to Inventions IV and V. Inventions I and II are unrelated to Inventions IV and V. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Invention III is a multi-layer container with a particular thickness per layer and stretch ratio, whereas

• Art Unit: 1761

Inventions IV and V have a different composition per layer and do not have any thickness or stretch ratio requirement.

Invention IV and V distinct because they are multi-layer containers made from different materials.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

### ***Election of Species***

Should applicant elect Group III, an election of species is further required. Group III contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- (a) a multi-layered container wherein a second layer comprises a co-polymer or ter-polymer of ethylene and glycidyl acrylate
- (b) a multi-layered container wherein a second layer comprises a co-polymer or ter-polymer of ethylene and maleic anhydride.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, 38 is generic.

Art Unit: 1761

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Madsen whose telephone number is (703)305-0068. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM M-F.

\* Art Unit: 1761

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (703)308-3959. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9310 for regular communications and (703)872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0061.

Robert Madsen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1761

May 1, 2002



**MILTON I. CANO**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700**